



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,712	11/24/2003	Nigel Green	ZNET.099A	5376
29995 7590 12/24/2008 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER				
LIU, LIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2445				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/24/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com  
eOAPilot@kmob.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/720,712

**Applicant(s)**

GREEN, NIGEL

**Examiner**

LIN LIU

**Art Unit**

2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2008.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 44-48 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/30/2008  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed on 10/30/2008. Claims 1-48 are pending and have been examined.
2. The information disclosure statement (I.D.S) filed on 10/30/2008 is considered.

***Election/Restrictions***

3. Applicant's election without traverse of *invention I* in the reply filed on 10/30/2008 is acknowledged.

Applicant is advised to cancel the non-elected claims in the next response to the Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 27-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Regarding claim 27, the phrase "may be" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). Dependent claims are reject for the same reason.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14 and 16-37 and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by **Blinn et al. (Patent no.: US 6,484,150 B1)**.

With respect to **claim 1**, Blinn teaches a method of dynamically generating and serving web pages, the method comprising:

receiving a page request at a server, the page request generated by a web browser running on a user computer and corresponding to a web page that is generated dynamically (Blinn: fig. 12, and col. 17, lines 27-32, noted the browser requests);

in response to the page request, sending a service request to a service to request service data to incorporate into the web page (Blinn: col. 13, lines 33-53, and col. 17, lines 32-38, noted the template);

before the service returns the service data, transmitting to the web browser a first portion of the web page, said first portion including viewable content (Blinn: col. 13, lines 33-53, and col. 27-50, noted the template is sent to the browser), and including a placeholder for the requested service data (Blinn: col. 13, line 54 to col. 14 line 22, and col. 59-65, noted the embedded directives);

after the service returns the service data and before the web page has been fully loaded, transmitting to the web browser a second portion of the web page, the second portion including the service data (Blinn: col. 13, lines 43-53 and col. 17, lines 36-50, noted the extracted service data from the database 121); and

transmitting to the user computer a page update handler which, when executed by the web browser, incorporates the service data included within the second portion of the web page into the first portion of the web page in a viewable form (Blinn: col. 13 line 54 to col. 14 line 22 and col. 17 lines 40-65, noted the template is finally composed as a HTML page with the directive data and rendered to the user).

With respect to **claim 2**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the placeholder comprises a display object, and the page update handler populates the display object with at least some of the service data included within the second portion of the web page (Blinn: col. 13 line 54 to col. 14 line 22 and col. 18 lines 34-57).

With respect to **claim 3**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the display object is positioned above at least some of said viewable content within the first portion of the web page (Blinn: fig. 13A, col. 17, lines 51-63).

With respect to **claim 4**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the service data is included in the second portion of the web page in a condensed form in which at least some format coding is omitted, and the page update handler adds format coding to the service data to format the service data for display, whereby a quantity of data transmitted to the web browser is reduced (Blinn: col. 13, line 33 to col. 14, line 22 and col. 17 lines 36-65).

With respect to **claim 5**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the service data is included in the second portion of the web page in a hidden format (Blinn: col. 13, line 43 to col. 14 line 22, SQL query).

With respect to **claim 6**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the page update handler is transmitted to the user computer as part of the first portion of the web page (Blinn: col. 13, lines 33-53, and col. 17, lines 32-38, noted the template).

With respect to **claim 8**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the placeholder for the requested service data is included within the first portion of the web page in response to a failure of the service to return the service data within a selected time interval (Blinn: col. 13, lines 33-53).

With respect to **claim 9**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the placeholder for the requested service data is included within the first portion of the web page in response to a server decision to defer rendering of a portion of the web page, said server decision being based at least in part on response time data collected for the service (Blinn: col. 13, lines 38-53).

With respect to **claim 10**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the placeholder for the requested service data is included within the first portion of the web page in response to a server decision to defer rendering of a portion of the web page, said server decision taking into consideration at least one of the following: (a) a load level of the service, (b) a load level of a web server system that responds to the page request (Blinn: col. 13, lines 38-53 and col. 17, lines 28-50).

With respect to **claim 11**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the second portion of the web page includes a command that causes the web browser to execute the page update handler (Blinn: col. 14, lines 3-22).

With respect to **claim 12**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the first portion of the web page includes a command that causes the web browser to execute the page update handler upon completion of loading of the web page (Blinn: col. 18, lines 21-57).

With respect to **claim 14**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the service request is one of a plurality of service requests generated in response to the page request (Blinn: col. 13, lines 33-53).

With respect to **claim 16**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the page update handler selects a display format to use to display the service data in the web page based at least in part on a dimension of a window of the web browser running on the user computer (Blinn: fig. 7 & 11, col. 14, lines 3-22).

With respect to **claim 17**, Blinn teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the page update handler selects a display format to use to display the service data in the web page based at least in part on a quantity of the service data (Blinn: fig. 7 & 11, col. 14, lines 3-22).

With regard to **claims 18-26**, the limitations of these claims are substantially the same as those in claims 1-6, 8-12, 14 and 16-17. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claims 1-6, 8-12, 14 and 16-17 is used to reject claims 18-26. By this rationale **claims 18-26** are rejected.

With regard to **claims 27-37 and 39-43**, the limitations of these claims are substantially the same as those in claims 1-6, 8-12, 14 and 16-17. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claims 1-6, 8-12, 14 and 16-17 is used to reject claims 27-37 and 39-43. By this rationale **claims 27-37 and 39-43** are rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Blinn et al. (Patent no.: US 6,484,150 B1)** in view of **Starkey (PGPUB: US 2002/0059327 A1)**.



With respect to **claim 7**, Blinn teaches all of claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of transmitting a page update handler to the user computer as part of a library file, separately from the web page.

In the same field of endeavor, Starkey teaches a method of transmitting a page update handler to the user computer as part of a library file, separately from the web page (Starkey: fig. 1, page 3, paragraphs 38-39, note the Java Classes).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the features above as taught by Starkey in Blinn's invention in order to reduce network traffic by transmitting packets separately over the network.

With respect to **claim 13**, Blinn teaches all of claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of embedding a JavaScript function in the HTML page.

In the same field of endeavor, Starkey teaches a method of embedding a JavaScript function in the HTML page. (Starkey: fig. 1, page 3, paragraphs 38-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the features above as taught by Starkey in Blinn's invention as a designer's choice.

12. Claims 15 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Blinn et al. (Patent no.: US 6,484,150 B1)** in view of **Samar (Patent no.: US 6,563,514 B1)**.

With respect to **claim 15**, Blinn teaches all of the claimed limitations, except that he does not explicitly teach a method of implementing the web page as mouse-over text that is displayed by the web browser when a mouse cursor is positioned over a corresponding display element.

In the same field of endeavor, Samar teaches a method of implementing the web page as mouse-over text that is displayed by the web browser when a mouse cursor is positioned over a corresponding display element (Samar: abstract, fig. 8, and col. 10, lines 26-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the features above as taught by Samar in Blinn's invention in order to dynamically display the additional information with regard to the element without requiring any further action from the user (Samar: col. 1, lines 59-67).

With regard to **claims 38**, the limitations of this claim are substantially the same as those in claim 15. Therefore the same rationale for rejecting claim 15 is used to reject claim 38. By this rationale **claim 38** is rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Singhal et al. (Patent no.: US 7,096,418 B1) discloses a dynamic web page cache system.

- Alexander (Patent no.: US 6,732,331 B1) discloses a system for managing content organized in a tag-delimited template using metadata.
- Koike et al. (Patent no.: US 7,194,678 B1) discloses a dynamic web page generation system.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LIN LIU whose telephone number is (571)270-1447.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST.

15. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571)-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lin Liu/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/Patrice Winder/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445

